

UNITED STATE EPARTMENT OF COMMERCE Patent and Trademark Offic

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS

Washington, D.C. 20231

 APPLICATION NO.
 FILING DATE
 FIRST NAMED INVENTOR
 ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.

 09/196, 86/
 11/20/98
 KELSALL
 B
 14014.0312

HM32/1024

MARY L MILLER
NEEDLE & ROSENBERG
SUITE 1200 THE CANDLER BULDG
127 PEACHTREE STREET N E
ATLANTA GA 30303-1811

PTO-90C (Rev. 2/95)

DECLUUX, A

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

DATE MAILED:

10/24/00

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

b

Advisory Action

Application No.

09/196,867

Applicam(s)

Kelsall et al

Examiner

DeCloux, Amy

Group Art Unit 1644



T .,	F REDIOD FOR RESPONSE: (sheek only a) or b)]
	E PERIOD FOR RESPONSE: [check only a) or b)] a) expires months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
	b) expires either three months from the mailing date of the final rejection, or on the mailing date of this Advisory Action, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for the response expire later than six months from the date of the final rejection.
	Any extension of time must be obtained by filing a petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a), the proposed response and the appropriate fee. The date on which the response, the petition, and the fee have been filed is the date of the response and also the date for the purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. Any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.17 will be calculated from the date of the originally set shortened statutory period for response or as set forth in b) above.
	Appellant's Brief is due two months from the date of the Notice of Appeal filed on (or within any period for response set forth above, whichever is later). See 37 CFR 1.191(d) and 37 CFR 1.192(a).
αA	plicant's response to the final rejection, filed on <u>Oct. 3, 2000</u> has been considered with the following effect, t is NOT deemed to place the application in condition for allowance:
	The proposed amendment(s):
	will be entered upon filing of a Notice of Appeal and an Appeal Brief.
	will not be entered because:
	they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search. (See note below).
	they raise the issue of new matter. (See note below).
	they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal.
	they present additional claims without cancelling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.
	NOTE:
	Applicant's response has overcome the following rejection(s):
	Applicant's response has overcome the following rejection(s):
	Applicant's response has overcome the following rejection(s): Newly proposed or amended claims would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment cancelling the non-allowable claims.
	Applicant's response has overcome the following rejection(s): Newly proposed or amended claims would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment cancelling the non-allowable claims. The affidavit, exhibit or request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:
	Applicant's response has overcome the following rejection(s): Newly proposed or amended claims would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment cancelling the non-allowable claims. The affidavit, exhibit or request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition
	Applicant's response has overcome the following rejection(s): Newly proposed or amended claims would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment cancelling the non-allowable claims. The affidavit, exhibit or request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The 37 CFR 1.131 declaration of Drs. Brian Kelsall. Warren Strober, Thomas Marth and Ivan Fuss is unsigned. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the
	Applicant's response has overcome the following rejection(s): Newly proposed or amended claims
	Applicant's response has overcome the following rejection(s): Newly proposed or amended claims would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment cancelling the non-allowable claims. The affidavit, exhibit or request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The 37 CFR 1.131 declaration of Drs. Brian Kelsall. Warren Strober. Thomas Marth and Ivan Fuss is unsigned. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection. For purposes of Appeal, the status of the claims is as follows (see attached written explanation, if any):
	Applicant's response has overcome the following rejection(s): Newly proposed or amended claims would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment cancelling the non-allowable claims. The affidavit, exhibit or request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The 37 CFR 1.131 declaration of Drs. Brian Kelsall. Warren Strober. Thomas Marth and Ivan Fuss is unsigned. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection. For purposes of Appeal, the status of the claims is as follows (see attached written explanation, if any): Claims allowed:
	Applicant's response has overcome the following rejection(s): Newly proposed or amended claims
	Applicant's response has overcome the following rejection(s): Newly proposed or amended claims
	Applicant's response has overcome the following rejection(s): Newly proposed or amended claims
	Applicant's response has overcome the following rejection(s): Newly proposed or amended claims